The MILITANT

Semi-Monthly Organ of the Opposition Group in the Communist Party of America

"It is necessary that every member of the Party should study calmly and with the greatest objectivity, first the substance of the differences of opinion, and then the development of the struggles within the Party. Neither the one nor the other can be done unless the documents of both sides are published. He who takes somebody's word for it is a hopeless idiot, who can be disposed of with a simple gesture of the hand."—Lenin

VOL II. No. 6. NEW YORK, N. Y., MARCH, 15, 1929. PRICE 5 CENTS

The Results of the Party Convention

By James P. Cannon

The Party Convention which was to "end the factional struggle and unify the Party" ended with a free-for-all fist fight, the sharpening of the internal strife, the wide distribution of new caucus documents and a race to Moscow by representatives of both factions. It could not be otherwise. This bankruptcy is only the reflection of the political and ideological collapse of the Stalinist regime in the Communist International, a regime which stultifies revolutionary thought, suppresses discussion and undertakes to solve all difficulties which arise from its barren policy with organizational manipulations. The unanimous endorsement of the Stalin leadership by the Convention was an appropriate act.

The convention sessions themselves were an empty formality. The real activity consisted of a long series of caucuses by the two factions and was confined almost exclusively to the paltry struggle over the office of Party Secretary. The mechanical exclusion of the Opposition prevented a discussion of the great principle questions which confront the Communist International and which lie at the bottom of the fierce factional struggles in all the parties. The convention delegates, carefully selected from the standpoint of their indifference to these questions, naturally could not touch them —they do not even understand them—and this failure doomed the convention to ignominious futility from the start. Without facing these issues, which are the determining factor in the whole Comintern, and taking part in the effort to solve them on the right basis of principle, there can be no "liquidation of the factional struggle" no matter how often the "unprincipledness" of this struggle is proclaimed.

THE "ISSUE" AT THE CONVENTION

Almost the entire activity of the two caucuses—which met in joint session occasionally as the Sixth Convention of the Party—was devoted to the manoeuvre of Stalin which was presented by the two representatives of the Executive Committee of the Communist International: the proposal that Foster should be appointed Secretary of the Party. The fact that a secondary organization question of this kind should become the central problem of the convention is in itself a significant characterization of the gathering. The motive behind this Stalin strategy is quite obvious. In the first place it was a form of pressure on the Lovestone faction to make a complete break with Bucharin. It was also designed to graft Foster onto the Lovestone faction as its "American" expression and decoy for the proletarian communists who are fighting it under the banner of the Communist Opposition. It was easy to accomplish the first aim, for here it was a question of dealing with people without definite principles or loyalties. The second aim had no chance to succeed. It failed to consider the principle motives that animate the proletarian supporters of the Opposition and it underestimated their political intelligence.

The reactions of the two groups in the Convention to this proposal regarding the secretaryship throw an interesting light on their actual character. The Bittleman group went into convulsions of enthusiasm over it and regarded it as, almost, the "final victory." For it they completely forgot their "political line," they scrapped their Convention theses, they declared a still more "merciless" struggle against the Communist Opposition and howled for "unity" with the "Right Wing"—with Lovestone, Pepper, Wicks, Stachel, Wolfe, Minor, Olgin or anyone else of a similar stripe who would accept it. How can such an attitude be explained? It is only a few weeks ago that Bittleman issued a statement, signed also by a number of lieutenants and new recruits, repudiating Foster's position on very important questions **from a principle standpoint**. Foster himself stated in his article that Bittleman had denounced his position as "liquidating everything connected with Communism." Foster' articles reaffirmed his stand as against that of Bittleman and all the rest of the group. How then can the appointment of Foster be regarded as such a great "concession" to the Bittleman faction that everything else can be cheerfully sacrificed? The incident demonstrates quite clearly that organization positions play the main role in this case and that the "theses" (cast aside so soon and so lightly) and the big talk about "political line" (forgotten already) were merely trimmings. What kind of a group is this which divides over political questions and reunites over organization questions?

THE MOBILIZATION AGAINST FOSTER

The attitude of the Lovestone group to the Stalin Manoeuvre was more business-like, practical and "political" in the Stalinist sense. They took away its main motive by introducing a resolution for Stalin and against Bucharin,—thus refuting at the same time the accusation that they are purely and simply a "Right Wing." They can also be "Center" or "Left" if occasion demands. Their next step was to discredit the proposal to make Foster Secretary of the Party. For this they put forward their "proletarian" delegations to attack Foster's war record openly in the Convention. The article signed by W. J. White in the Daily Worker of March 4th was part of this campaign and Poor White of course did not write the article. It is quite obvious that Bedacht and Lovestone wrote it. "Where was the 'leader' of the opposition during the past war?" asks the article. "Does his record in the past war assure reliability in the coming war? **It does not.**" With words like these and others even more blunt and outspoken on the convention floor the carefully coached "proletarians" hammered at the candidacy of Foster for the secretaryship. Thus the Lovestone caucus was solidified against the "War Danger" and Foster. They finished by electing three secretaries with equal rights, one of whom is Foster in the same position he held before the Convention and with even less prestige.

The Bittleman-Foster caucus document accuses the Lovestone faction, because of its rejection of Foster as Secretary, of placing the Convention "in the position of open hostility to the C.I."—that is, to the Stalin faction. But that doesn't follow at all—the wish probably influences the thought that thereby they would receive the favors that come only to the "loyal" ones. They didn't understand Lovestone's manoeuvre any more than they understood Stalin's. It is absurd to think the Lovestone-

CONTINUED ON PAGE 5

New York Workers Protest Trotsky's Exile Stalinites Plan Pogrom -- and Stage Fizzle

The protest meeting of the Communist workers of New York against the banishment of Trotsky was held with a packed hall at Labor Temple Tuesday night and ended with great enthusiasm and loud cheers for Trotsky and the Communist Opposition at 11.30. A collection of $60.50 for the Weekly Militant was taken after an admission fee of 25 cents at the door. Cannon, Abern and Shachtman were the speakers. The names of the Workers Guard who protected the meeting are too numerous to mention. Those who attempted to disrupt the meeting from the inside left so quickly that their names could not be learned. Those who were known to have come to carry out the instructions of the Stalin bureaucrats to break up the meeting—mainly paid functionaries—were refused admission by the Workers Guard at the door and were given the opportunity to denounce "Trotskyism" to their hearts' content in the wide open spaces of 14th Street.

A committee from the I.W.W. sat on the platform with the speakers and Fellow Worker Edelman spoke in their name, pledging the support of the I.W.W. workers to maintain the right of Free Speech for the Communist Opposition notwithstanding their disagreement with its program. A number of I.W.W. workers also served on the Workers Guard which defended the meeting. Dr. Edmund Chaffee of the American Civil Liberties Union also spoke, pointing out that the A.C.L.U. had always defended the right of the Party to hold public meetings and would do the same for the Communist Opposition.

Shortly after the meeting began, while comrade Abern was speaking, a group of Lovestone scouts attempted to force entrance at the rear door and rush the platform. They ran into a strong detachment of the Workers Guard which was concentrated at that point and were soon thrown out. The leader of this raid, one Gomez, had foolishly bumped his head against the door and seemed to be under the illusion that Trotsky was in the hall in the act of betraying the Soviet Union. He was allowed to remain and to wander around the room at will, but after a few feeble heckles, he left the meeting of his own accord.

The class struggle had been declared off for the night by the Stalin officialdom of the Party and instructions were sent to all Party units to mobilize the entire Party membership to break up our meeting. Preparations were made to stage a pogrom against the Opposition, but it was a pitiful fiasco. Its net result was to demonstrate the futility of these methods and the weakness of their sponsors, to strengthen the fighting spirit of the Opposition workers and to create the beginning of a united front of all progressive workers against fascist methods in the labor movement—from the side of Lovestone and Foster as well as from the side of Sigman and Lewis.

The subsidized liars of the Daily Worker and Freiheit, striving to win the Brass Check medal for 1929, give an account of the meeting that will not be recognized by anyone who attended it. Among other things they say that we (we!) brought police to the meeting and "gave orders" to them. These people whose leader, Lovestone, testified in a capitalist court against a Communist and helped to send him to the penitentiary, cannot imagine why we should not call the police. Their accusation, therefore, is perhaps as much instinctive reaction as conscious falsehood.

The director of the Labor Temple announced from the platform that he had called the police against our protest and said he had done so because of the riot at the previous meeting. The police wanted to let the hoodlums into the hall, but our Workers Guard at the door refused. It is very important to establish the facts about such questions, and for that reason we asked representatives of the I.W.W. and the A.C.L.U. to attend the meeting to observe and give an opinion of the conduct of all concerned. Lies against us in general are too numerous to answer but lies about the police business will be checked down to their roots and the real facts clearly established to the satisfaction of all honest workers.

One final lie of the Stalinite press. We are accused of having had gangsters and thugs at the meeting to protect us. These "gangsters and thugs" were, every one of them, fighters in the revolutionary movement and fresh from the picket line in the needle trades Left Wing fight and other battles where their only connection with gangsters was to be beaten and slashed by the thugs employed by the Right Wing. The day after they are cheered for their courage on the picket line, the Daily Worker and Freiheit denounce them as "thugs." The Stalinite scribblers have lost all sense of shame.

* * *

A successful meeting was also held in Philadelphia on St. Patrick's Day with James P. Cannon speaking. The meeting was under the auspices of the Open Forum of the Friendship Liberal League, where Party representatives have often spoken. There was a "mobilization of the Party" to break up the meeting which ended in a fizzle and brought discredit on the Stalinites. The disruption was organized by Benjamin, the district organizer of the Party, but only a dozen or so Party members could be mustered for the job. (This is true in all cities; the working class core of the Party has no heart for these reactionary methods.) Benjamin, who is as yellow as the yolk of an egg, remained two miles behind the lines like a real general. There he eventually received reports that his hoodlums had hit the sidewalk a few minutes after the trouble began. The meeting continued, with questions and discussion, till midnight.

* * *

Two smashing defeats for Stalinism in three days! The Opposition will be heard!

Who Supports Trotsky?

More on Counter-revolution's United Front with Trotsky

In the previous issue of The Militant we printed a series of comments by the bourgeois, the fascist, the social-democratic and the anarchist press on the exile of Trotsky from the Soviet Union. We proved conclusively that the reactionary and anti-labor press of all shades is AGAINST Trotsky and the Russian Opposition. The quotations we printed gave the lie complete to the declarations in the Stalinite press that the bourgeoisie and the yellow social democracy is "in alliance" with Trotsky or supports him in any way. The Stalinite press,the Daily Worker, Freiheit, etc., still fail to print excerpts from the judgment of the bourgeoisie on the controversy in the Russian Party and the International. Below we publish a few additional comments which add further proof to our contention that Trotsky and the Opposition are fighting for Bolshevism, and that the enemies of the Communist movement oppose him and lean upon Stalin and the opportunists.

The **New York Daily News,** owned by the arch-reactionary Chicago **Tribune** the voice of the open-shop International Harvester and the most rabid imperialist jingoes, published an editorial entitled "That Squawk from Trotsky:"

> "Stalin worked along with Lenin and Trotsky in the first wild years following the Russian Revolution. Gradually he acquired power. Lenin died. Stalin formed his own ideas of government, and they disagreed with Trotsky's ideas in several important respects. *Stalin is moderate, a bit of a compromiser; Trotsky is the wing-tip feather on the left wing of Communism.*
>
> "Now Stalin is master in a Russia which begins to realize that even that monster, capitalism, has something to teach a proletarian dictatorship. In January of last year he and his political machine felt that the time was ripe for the bouncing of the extremists. Numerous extremists were accordingly bounced, landing in secluded spots in Siberia and Central Asia. Trotsky was among them.
>
> "He has finally won to the neutral city of Constantinople, and it is from there that he sends up these squawks.
>
> "It is hard to take Trotsky seriously. *He was and is the leading Communist preacher of the doctrine of force to the uttermost, the ruthless stamping out of any one or anything hostile to the political and economic tenets of Marxism.* Now Stalin has turned Trotsky's doctrines on Trotsky.
>
> "But instead of resigning himself to the 'march of events,' which is one of his favorite expressions, Trotsky moans and groans. It is rather as if a pickpocket should run into a police station and demand the arrest of an intended victim who had bruised his business arm.
>
> "Trotsky will never know it, but the true explanation of his fate is that the old religion of Leninism simply will not work. The Russians must get back to bourgeois trading in order to give the average Russian an incentive to work. (March 2, 1929. Our emphasis.)

The **Daily News** is joined in the united front of the Stalinite and bourgeois press by the yellow gutter weekly of the Jewish Federation of the Socialist Party, Der Wecker. Its editor writes as follows:

> "Nevertheless the Communist press is not entirely wrong when it assures us that Trotskyism is dead. Insofar as Trotskyism is orthodox, pure Communism it is certainly dead. Insofar as the tiny handful of true Trotskyists dream about returning to true Communism, about continuing the Communist tactics of the years of bloom of the Comintern, about preparing themselves to make the world revolution, about maintaining the revolutionary purity and proletarian character of Communism, Trotskyism is certainly dead. Trotskyism is dead because 'true Communism' about which Trotsky and his comrades dream, is dead. This 'true Communism' was nothing more than a passing phenomenon which had to disappear, a result of the post-war despair and chaos, which could not last very long. Inasmuch as Trotskyism is the yearning to return to true Communism it is nothing more than the dream of a handful of hopeless romanticists who look upon the world through blind eyes and can in no way understand that the 'treason of the Stalinists' was forced upon the Communist movement by objective reality." (February 9, 1929.)

These words have a familiar ring. Apparently we have heard them on a similar occasion and in a different place. To be sure. Practically the same thoughts, dressed up in a bit of Stalinite war-paint, appear regularly in the editorial and news columns of the **Freiheit.** A peculiar united front, indeed. and it is not the only form that the new united front tactic of the Stalinites—from below and above!—assumes.

In Germany, the Stalinites are in a close united front with the fascists, monarchists, nationalists and anti-semites to prevent Trotsky from coming to Germany at all costs. The Party fraction in the Reichstag has introduced an amendment to the government's proposed law on the right of asylum for political refugees. The amendment calls for refusal to grant the right of asylum to anyone whose objective is the overthrow of the regime in the Soviet Union. Who is to decide what persons come under that category? The Stalin faction and its German agents. Upon whose head is this decision always certain to fall? Upon the head of Trotsky and any other supporter of the Leninist Opposition who is exiled from Russia and requests asylum in Germany.

It must be remembered that Berlin is filled with White Guards, Russian monarchists, Mensheviks, Social Revolutionaries, anarchists and other counter-revolutionary elements. They maintain organizations and publish papers there, unmolested. The Stalinites do not raise any hue and cry against them. They do not demand that these genuine counter-revolutionaries be expelled from the country. Of course not. They are too busy demanding the head of the Russian Opposition. Their whole activity of defending the Soviet Union" is centered around their shameful campaign against comrade Trotsky and his friends.

It is an old axiom that when a group begins to fight against the revolutionary elements, it soon finds itself being supported by the worst enemies of the working class. The fight of the Stalinites against the Russian Opposition has led them closer and closer to the camp of capitulation and compromise. There is nothing surprising in the fact that a common fear of Trotsky's presence in Germany unites the fascisti and nationalists with the Stalinites in a mad campaign against his entry.

YOUNGSTOWN MEETING

A meeting to protest against the deportation of L. D. Trotsky from the U.S.S.R. will be held in Youngstown, Ohio, on Sunday, March 31st, 1929 at 2 P. M. in the afternoon at the Labor Lyceum, 307 No. Walnut St. Among the speakers are Leo Glazer and John Brahtin of Cleveland. Admission is 25 cents and the meeting is under the auspices of the Militant Workers Club.

THE MILITANT

Published twice a month by the Opposition Group in the Communist Party of America

Address all mail to: P. O. Box 120, Madison Square Station, New York, N. Y.

Publishers address at 340 East 19th Street, New York, N. Y. — Telephone: Gramercy 3411.

Subscription rate: $1.00 per year. Foreign, $1.50

5c per copy Bundle rates, 3c per copy.

Editor James P. Cannon

Associate Editors Martin Abern, Max Shachtman, Maurice Spector

VOL. II. MARCH 15, 1929. No. 6

Entered as second-class mail matter November 28, 1928, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Minneapolis is Leading in the Weekly Drive

The Minneapolis group of the Opposition Communists took the lead in the campaign for a $2,000 fund to establish The Militant as a weekly with a contribution of $206 collected from the members and sympathizers of the Opposition in the Twin Cities.

Vincent Dunne, who is in charge of the Minneapolis Campaign Committee, writes as follows:

"We are sending you with this letter a check for $206. and we wish to assure you that this is but the first installment of the amount for which we feel responsible as the pioneers of the Opposition in Dist. 9.

"We are proceeding in an organized manner to the collection of funds and with the help of the truly magnificent lists which have been provided by the comrades at the Center, we feel that the amount which has been set as the first objective should be in the hands of the comrades in a very short time.

"The developments at the Party Convention, as well as the developments Internationally, indicate that our tasks are of tremendous proportions. The Weekly Militant MUST be established with the least possible delay."

Maurice Spector sends $30 collected by the Toronto group as the first installment on their quota of the $2,000 fund for the Weekly.

Chicago, which has pledged a quota of $500, sends $20.50, making a total of $120 for the fund up to date.

The New York group at its last meeting voted to accept a quota of $500 and to concentrate on the work for the Weekly until this sum is raised. $10.75 was collected by the Hungarian group at a small dinner on March 9th. All comrades are now working with the lists.

The Cleveland and Detroit groups have also reported the beginning of activities for the Weekly Fund, and responses from the lists mailed out to individuals are coming in.

Reports on the campaign are still awaited from Boston, Kansas City, New Haven, Philadelphia and other active groups of the Vanguard.

The above reports show that the Campaign for the Weekly Militant—our most important action at the moment and the basis for our future work—is now getting under way in full swing.

Its results will be a test of the seriousness of the Opposition Communists in their fight for the preservation of the Communist movement; it will be a guage of their fighting capacity for the great battles that lie ahead.

A victory in this campaign will have the greatest bearing on the consolidation and strengthening of the Communist Opposition.

The action of the Party Convention in ignoring our Appeal, in disregarding all the principle questions before the movement and in occupying itself the whole time with the squabble over offices, only demonstrates the necessity of sharpening the fight.

The Opposition Communists must equip themselves to deal heavier hammer blows against the bureaucrats of both factions. The Weekly Militant will be our weapon for this fight.

United, determined and energetic work to establish the Weekly Militant!

Let this be the slogan of the hour.

Amount necessary to establish the Weekly	**$2,000.00**
Total received to date	**382.00**
Balance needed	**$1618.00**

Send Contributions to
THE MILITANT
Box 120, Madison Square Station
New York City.

The Civil War in Mexico

By Max Shachtman

CIVIL war, the bitterest one since the insurrection of De la Huerta in 1923, is sweeping over Mexico. On the part of the "rebels" it is an attempt to revive the rule of the military cliques and generals, allied with the reactionary feudal and clerical interests, dominating the country and extorting tribute at the pistol point from the bulk of the people. The militarists hope to anticipate the presidential elections in November with a successful uprising that will install them in the position of dictators.

The Calles-Gil regime is just as determined to suppress the uprising of the reaction in the interests of bourgeois "Order." They stand for the regular processes of capitalist democracy under which the native bourgeoisie will have the opportunity to develop "peacefully" as a stepchild of their American imperialist masters.

United States imperialism is for "peace" in Mexico. That is why Hoover and Kellogg are giving the undisguised support of the American government to the Federals. They want no elements that will upset the halcyon equilibrium in which the United States has enrolled Mexico into its imperialist domain—whether these elements are represented by reactionary militarist cliques or a rebellious working class and peasantry. Those who elected Hoover want the enforced peace under which the workers and peasants of Mexico can be exploited to the maximum with the least possibility of resistance on their part.

The Mexican government will undoubtedly succeed in suppressing the uprising. The reaction, which does not possess any progressive social basis, is opposed by a fairly-well centralized government which has, in addition, the powerful support of the American imperialists. Further, the Catholic reaction is by no means as firmly behind the uprising as it was in previous attempts. It is known, for instance, that General Roberto Cruz, one of the "rebels," was most active in suppressing the Catholics as chief of police in Mexico City under Calles; and that General J. G. Escobar was similarly occupied only a short time ago. It may be that the clericals will take advantage of the tumult to gain ground, but the religious element is less of a factor in the present struggle than at almost any other previous time.

At the same time, however, the disorganization and shift of forces attendant upon every war, gives the proletariat and the peasantry added possibilities to advance their own interests and weaken the position of their class enemy. The relation of forces in Mexico at the present time offers the Communist Party and the revolutionary proletariat unusual opportunities.

What shall be the attitude and activity of the Communist Party, which is the only force that can lead the proletariat and peasantry on the correct class road?

Up to now, unfortunately, the Mexican Communist Party—not to speak of the Party in the United States—has followed a confused and incorrect policy. The Party is still affected with the wrong policies followed for the past few years. In 1927, the Communist Party put up no presidential candidate but supported Obregon without conditions as against the reactionaries Gomez and Serrano, despite the fact that Obregon's program was "based on the desire to build a strong native bourgeoisie" having the "support of the petty bourgeoisie and a part of the larger bourgeoisie." (The Communist, August-September 1927). In all critical moments, the Communist Party continued to give practically unconditional support to the bourgeois government of Calles and later Gil. It seems that all Calles had to do to insure himself against any attacks from the Communists was to send a meaningless, phrase-filled telegram to the headquarters of the Anti-Imperialist League which immediately advertized him as a militant warrior against American imperialism. As late as February of this year, the representatives of the Trade Union Educational League to the Congress that organized the Left Wing Mexican trade union center, Albert Weisbord, presented a program of 11 point in which no mention is made of the foremost necessity of a relentless struggle against the Calles-Gil regime as a strike-breaking agency functioning in the interests of American imperialism.

The Mexican Party, it is true, forsaw the present civil war. But the line it proposed in its thesis of a few months ago, and the line contained in its appeal to the workers and peasants on March 5, one day after the militarist uprising, while liberated to a certain extent from the policy of following at the tail of the Mexican bourgeoisie, continues to be dominated by uncertainty and lack of independence or knowledge of goal. The aim of the Mexican Party in the present situation was presented and apparently adopted by the Mexico City trade union Congress. "The goal of this conference," writes Weisbord in his reports, "was the democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants, and they practically said so in so many words." (Daily Worker, February 19, 1929.)

The democratic dictatorship of workers and peasants is bourgeois democracy in revolt against feudalism and the slogan of the bourgeois revolution. The bourgeois revolution, however, has already triumphed in Mexico. Its representatives now control the Mexican government. The "democratic" Calles-Gil regime has already demonstrated its anti-labor character by suppressing strikes and seeking to regiment the workers into semi-governmental, semi-fascist unions. It has failed to carry out agrarian reforms in the interests of the peasantry. It has followed a policy of abject servility to the American imperialists.

The perspective of a proletarian struggle for power in Mexico which alone can "complete" the democratic revolution under workers rule is therefore postponed for an indefinite period by the advancement of the slogan of a democratic dictatorship. It means to transform the Calles-Gill regime into the rallying center of the "democratic revolution' with a sort of moderate pressure from the Left (the workers and peasants) that labors under the illusion that the Mexican bourgeoisie has still a great progressive role to play in the struggle against reaction and foreign imperialist oppression.

Therein also lies the weakness of the Mexican Party's manifesto on the civil war. When it urges that the workers and peasants be armed, it addresses this appeal to Gil and Calles as the leaders of the struggle against reaction. The appeal reads literally:

> "This is the situation today, and the working class and peasants, therefore, must act forthwith as follows:
>
> 1. It must demand from the Executive federal power, and all the local power, that all available arms and military equipment be turned over immediately to the workers and peasant organizations which, **together with the federal forces who remained loyal to the government,** shall insure protection to the territories and cities attacked by the reactionary troops." (Our emphasis.)

To arm the workers and peasants for the purpose of fighting "together with the federal forces who remained loyal to the government" is to create a "popular defense corps" for the bourgeoisie of Mexico and nothing more. It means at best that the Communists must wait until the so-called victory over reaction, i.e., the insurrectionary militarists, is assured before proceeding against the bourgeoisie. It means the resurrection in Mexico of the infamous "united national front" of the C. P. of China subordinated to Chiang Kai-Shek & Co., which led inevitably to the victory of the counter-revolution. For when the Mexican bourgeoisie, supported by American imperialism, has accomplished its victory over militarist reaction they will at the same time have so strengthened their own position that they will be able to establish "Order," to "deal with" the "menace from the Left," that is, the workers and peasants. To postpone the struggle against the Calles regime, as has been the time-worn policy of the Mexican Party, until it has fortified itself with even greater security than it now possesses is to abandon the very idea of a struggle for power for an indefinite period. Naturally, it is not a question here of the Communist Party of Mexico calling the proletariat and peasantry to rise in revolution for the immediate establishment of workers' power. This depends entirely on the development of the situation, the relation of forces, and the circumstances. The question here is one of line, perspective and action.

It is necessary that the Communist Party of Mexico should point out to the masses of workers and peasants that the Calles-Gil regime, whose progressive role is ended, can not solve the problems of the exploited people of the country. It must be repeated daily that the present government is the agent of American imperialism and the native bourgeoisie who have joined hands to oppress the workers and peasants of Mexico. The Party should emphasize that the proletariat leading the alliance with the peasantry must aim to seize power and that the chief obstacle in this path is the American-dominated, bourgeois, Calles-Gil regime. Instead of fostering illusions among the masses as to the "progressive role" the Calles regime is to play, (when it is certain that its role will be an even more reactionary one in the future), the Communists should root out these illusions. Otherwise it will never rise higher than playing the role of a "loyal opposition" from the Left to the Mexican bourgeois democracy.

The Mexican Party is—if reports in the Party press are to be relied upon—by no means an isolated sect. Weisbord reports that

> "the Party has taken the initiative and actually leads all mass movements which I have described in my several articles, published before, movements which have a minimum of 500,000 actual adherents. [The population of Mexico is only a little more than 14,000,000. M. S.] The Party not only leads the Workers and Agrarian Toilers Permanent Political Bloc, it not only leads the new trade union movements in Mexico, but when matters come to more direct and open clashes with the governmental and imperialistic forces, when the matter takes the form of a civil war, the Mexican C. P. without a doubt will be in the leadership as well." (Daily Worker, February 27, 1929.)

In addition, according to Weisbord, **El Machete,** the Party organ, has a circulation "closer to 175,000 than 15,000." But now that matters have taken the form of a civil war, the Mexican C. P. is not "in the leadership as well." And the Party will never be in the leadership of the struggle if it continues to follow its present line. All of its agitation for a "workers and peasants government" will be meaningless if it continues to be understood as a fight for the "democratic dictatorship," that is, for "real" bourgeois democracy.

The work of the Communist Party of Mexico and the interests of the proletarian revolution will further be retarded if the Party continues to play with the dangerous, reactionary idea of a Workers and Peasants Party, the first steps toward which have already been taken. The "Workers and Agrarian Toilers Permanent Politica Bloc" which the Party has formed is another name for a Workers and Peasants Party. A Workers and Peasants Party in Mexico, with the slogan of a "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry," will surely lead to a repetition on a smaller scale of the debacle of the Comintern with the Kuo-Min-Tang in China.

No progress will be made by the Mexican Communist Party toward the proletarian revolutionary goal unless it proceeds from the premise of unyielding antagonism to the idea—so prevalent in the Comintern of recent years—of a single Party in which two classes, the proletariat and the petty-bourgeoisie (peasantry) are merged. Such a course does not lead to the establishment of the leadership of the proletariat over the peasantry. it leads inevitably to the domination of the petty-bourgeois class interests of the peasantry who already outnumber the proletariat three or four times in the above-mentioned "Permanent (!) Bloc." Only if the proletariat, organized separately and independently on a class basis, leads the peasantry will it be able to prevent the latter from becoming the instrument of the bourgeoisie against the revolution.

The line followed by the Mexican Party has hampered its development but it is of course far from fatal. The present civil war, despite its relatively short duration offered the Party splendid opportunities for setting the masses into motion along the revolutionary road. There will still be numerous opportunities in the future, if the Party succeeds in correcting its policy. The Calles-Gil regime can establish "Order" not merely by defeating the militarist and clerical reaction but by the violent suppression of the workers' and peasants' movements. The manner in which even the yellow reformist C.R.O.M. was scuttled is an indication of the lengths to which the Mexican bourgeoisie will go to insure themselves—and their American imperialist masters—of a smooth, undisturbed course in the exploitation of the masses. The coming struggles in Mexico will advance the interests of the masses to the extent that the Communist Party is able to make the existence of the bourgeois regime precarious, and, finally, impossible.

The class conscious workers of the United States will follow events in Mexico with the keenest interest. Upon the revolutionaries here devolves the task of sabotaging and undermining all attempts that the United States will make to intervene against a genuinely revolutionary Mexico. Our warmest support goes to the Mexican fighters who are the pioneers of the final victory, feeling their way to the correct path, fighting with courage, and assured of the triumphant future of the toiling masses.

Some Remarks on the Sixth Congress

By L. D. Trotsky

Dear Comrade:—

You ask me my opinion of the Congress. Up to now I have at hand neither the final text of the Program, nor the resolutions of the Congress, with the exception of that on tactics adopted after the reading of the report by Bucharin. This I received yesterday. As is known, the drafts of the resolutions were not published—this in order to prevent those who are on "the other side" from comparing them with the final text. Thus many of the speeches appear to allude to something "unknown to anybody." A **final** judgment could be formed only after receiving all the resolutions. For the moment I will confine myself to some **provisional** remarks.

1. The Congress has attempted to inaugurate a new line of conduct without having abandoned the old. Automatically, the two clash. In many questions, starting from revisionist-opportunist premises we arrive at conclusions now opportunist, now extreme leftist. The Congress has changed its color during the very month while its sessions lasted, or rather it has increased its "leftward" coloring. Very opportunist expressions on stabilization are contained in the first report of Bucharin. But at the end of the theses concluding this same report some phrases are added "on the possibility of abrupt historical changes," which were taken word for word from our documents but without any exposition of the tendencies characterizing the imperialist epoch.

Besides an influx of new colonial elements coming especially from across the Atlantic, and other new tendencies appearing in the speeches and proposals of numerous delegates, the general spirit of the leadership of the Congress, and of its resolutions, was that of eclecticism and epigonism.

2. Although, I repeat, I do not yet possess the final text of the Program, it is clear already that things have not gone beyond dissimulation of the worst parts.

The Program is a consecration of eclecticism. It therefore contains in germ a whole series of revisionist-opportunist and ultra-leftist abcesses. Like the resolutions of the Congress in general, it ianugurates a period of immense changes in the heart of the Comintern.

3. The Congress occupied itself the whole time with the Opposition. It was held under the banner of defense—of defense against us. Hence its peculiar tone of insecurity. On every question it made prudent reservations. Those who wanted to, accepted the theses; those who did not, availed themselves of the reservations. The Opposition constituted one of the most important "sectors" in the hall, although it seems we had no representative there. On the question of the Program, the delegate from Indonesia, Alfonso, was the only one to speak clearly from our standpoint. **(Pravda,** No. 191.)

4. The question of stabilization was judged differently at different moments of the Congress, this again being due to the influence of our attitude on that point. For Europe and America stabilization is presented as "organic" and not "accidental." (Bucharin.) This absurd position easily allows inferences breaking with every principle of the Leninist analysis of the imperialist epoch (see the second chapter of my criticism of the Program.) At the same time it is announced that "in China the revolution is continuing." Anyone who thinks that after the defeats already suffered, China is going through a fairly extended period between two revolutions, is denounced as a liquidator.

5. No program of immediate demands was offered for this period of "organic stabilization," except the slogan of struggle against war.

6. The slogan of "strugle against war" was issued in a mechanical, isolated fashion, a real Bucharinist fashion. The Parties are urged to "concentrate all their forces" for this struggle. As if there were a special secret in the struggle against war, not to be found in any correct revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie and its state.

Bucharin poses in exactly the same way the question of the struggle against the social democracy. "We have already learned many things, but we have not yet learned to struggle against the social democracy," he says. As if this latter struggle were a special "art," independent of the correct line of revolutionary conduct in general.

7. While no program of immediate demands is offered, the struggle for the seizure of power is, on the other hand, indefinitely postponed. They present, as one of the most important tasks incumbent on the European Communist sections, the struggle for the Chinese Revolution. But there is no revolution at present in China; there is a counter-revolution. We cannot know when the revolution will have a rebirth there. In Europe even the perspective of a Revolution is practically abolished.

8. The report of Kuusinen on the colonial and semi-colonial countries is absolutely shameful in character. The poor devil has merely vomited up a lot of undigested Menshevism. Martinov had the pleasure of hearing himself talk exactly as he used to twenty years ago. The mere fact that the Congress did not drive Kuusinen from the tribune with an old broom is a warning.

9. The question of "peasant" and "worker and peasant" parties was left pending. They didn't dare touch the Peasants International. Some voices, to be sure, were raised in favor of creating parties of this kind, which would affiliate with the Communist Parties. The objections, timidly advanced, were not objections in principle. I do not yet know whether this question was broached in any way in the resolutions. This is in reality a question of life and death for the colonial Communist Parties, and even for the whole Comintern.

10. The slogan of the "democratic dictatorship of workers and peasants" is definitely transformed into a super-historical abstraction for four-fifths of humanity (Asia, Africa, South America.) The debates of the Congress, even according to the expurgated, polished and repainted reports appearing in **Pravda** make it evident that the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry signifies the path of the Kuo Min Tang with all possible historical variations.

11. I must quote here on this subject the truly refreshing words of Martinov:

"According to the opinion of Bucharin, we are in India on the eve of a transformation of the bourgeois and democratic revolution into a socialist revolution. But this is just what Radek said about China. What becomes, then, of the struggle against imperialism, the struggle for national liberation, the stage of the anti-imperialist dictatorship of workers and peasants? They disappear."

The struggle against imperialism "disappears" because it is conducted under the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the same way with us the agrarian revolution ought to have "disappeared" because it was not made till after the coup d'Etat of October.

12. The "Anti-Imperialist League" remains a sort of super-Kuo Min Tang, an arena in which adventurers and careerists from the colonial and imperialist countries may refresh their reputations at the expense of the oppressed peoples and of the proletariat. It suffices to point out that one of the representatives of this League for parliamentary carnivals, is the English demi-Purcell, Maxton, for whom our TASS[1] makes publicity as it recently did for Purcell.

13. By simply declaring the Chinese revolution "in process of continuation," the leaders have relieved themselves of the necessity of furnishing the Communist Party of China a program of action for the Stolypin period of Chiang Kai-Shek through which China is now passing. The absolutely necessary transitional slogans have not been issued: Expropriation of lands belonging to the "landed gentry," eight-hour day, abrogation of unequal treaties. The struggle for these slogans carried on also in the **parliament** (when the parliament is established) should lead, the moment the revolution begins anew, to the creation of Soviets and the battle for the dictatorship of the proletariat supported by the urban and rural poor. Our heroes, however, "jump over" the strategy of the present reactionary period in the evolution of China. They attempt to stuff up all holes with the panacea of the democratic dictatorship which in that country has a significance only for the Kuo Min Tang.

The report of Manuilsky[2] is remarkable only for the personality of the reporter. Things must have gone pretty far when they put on this harlequin, whom no one takes seriously (his masters less than others), introducing him as the attorney general and guardian of Marxist doctrine and Bolshevik instruction. Here the struggle against the Opposition has descended to the level of collecting anecdotes. This is an imprudent step.

A group which designates Manuilsky to defend its ideas is reaching the end of its rope.

14. The report of Varga, if weighed discerningly, presents material from the point of view of "socialism in one country," but in such a way that he will not be rendered entirely responsible for this theory. Varga is theoretically much too educated not to know that this whole conception cannot stand up.

In the Spring of 1926 when I was in Berlin, Varga said to me literally, in the presence of Lapinsky and Krestinsky, the following words:

"Obviously, this theory is false, but it gives the Russian worker a view of the future and sustains his morale. If the Russian worker were sufficiently developed to become enthusiastic over the international perspectives of the future, we would not have needed the theory of socialism in one country. In a word, this is a pious lie of the priest, but it offers salvation."

In the Communist International Varga is a theoretician like the Polonius of Hamlet. He is ready to demonstrate theoretically that the clouds on the horizon resemble a camel, or a fish, or, if this pleases the prince, even "socialism in one country," or in general whomever and whatever you wish. The Communist International already possesses a whole army of Poloniuses of this kidney.

15. The theses announce "a Bolshevization and internal consolidation" of the Parties of the Comintern, and "the suppression of the internal struggle." The Congress, however (even as seen through the bars set up by the editorial censors), presents a picture of an entirely different character. A violent and muffled struggle is developing all along the line. Factional groupings, large and small, revealed themselves at the Congress in the delegations from Germany, England, Poland, the United States, Rumania, Jugo-Slavia, etc. The delegation of the U.S.S.R. naturally was no exception. On the contrary, it is the one which transplants scissions into the other Parties. In a multitude of speeches complaints were heard about sharp factional battles "which are not justified by any serious political differences."

16. No one took the trouble to ask himself why these "factional struggles" "devour" "the internally consolidated Communist International." The answer is nevertheless clear. At present, the Communist International is basing itself on a bloc composed of the Right and the Center, or to speak more precisely, on the opportunist faction. The situation in the U.S.S.R., and the regime in the Communist International, have retarded the development of the differences of opinion between these groups, whereas the class struggle makes their coalition, shot at from all sides, insupportable. That is where the bitter factional struggles come from, in the absence of "important political differences."

17. Much was said at the Congress of the integration of the social democracy with the capitalist state. Incontestably, the social democratic and trade union bureaucracy is forced, because of the situation of the petty-bourgeois layers caught between the imperialist bourgeoisie and the proletariat, to assume at all critical moments, in all important questions, direct responsibility in the bourgois state. But, at the same time, the social democratic bureaucracy provides positions for new petty-bourgeois layers.

These positions are occupied in part by the Left social democracy, but for the great part by the Rignt Wing of the Comintern. In China and in England we have seen this phenomenon in its most complete and classic form. But the same tendencies exist also in other countries. It is the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which forms the basis of this situation.

In the Centrist-Left groupings of the Comintern we frequently see a distorted picture of proletarian tendencies that cannot attain legal expression under the present regime, in view of the mechanical destruction of the Opposition.

A differentiation of the proletarian and petty-bourgeois tendencies in the Comintern is absolutely inevitable and imminent.

18. The theses concerning the "victory over the Trotskyist Opposition" hinge upon that. It has already been said above that the whole Congress took place under the banner of a defense against us. We have already resumed the attack in the ideological domain on the whole international front. Only hopeless imbeciles can imagine (and hypocritical bureaucrats can confirm it) that the resolutions of the Sixth Congress, which approve those of the Fifteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, signify "the end of the Opposition." The end is still far off. The Opposition has only begun.

19. This resolution makes a pititful attempt to foist upon us the group of adventurers of Suhl who, with the workers duped by them, have passed from the Opposition to the social democracy. I will not explain here why good revolutionary workers are sometimes dragged along into all sorts of blind alleys which they can not get out of by themselves. The blame lies upon the leadership of the Comintern. Obviously, it also touches us indirectly: we have not been able up to the present to state our views clearly, resolutely and concretely enough, adapting them to the situation in each country. But one thing is clear: a certain group which, for a brief lapse of time, had come to us and to our former allies of the Bloc (Zinoviev and Co.) went over to the social democrats. We are neither more nor less responsible for it than are the leaders of the present regime for the events of Smolensk, Artemovsk, Schachty, etc., which took place under their leadership.

If we bear the responsibility for the defection of the Suhl group, our accusers must answer for the faction of Malachov.

20. The Congress has again shown the inefficacy of crude pretences. By minimizing differences of opinion, by adopting a hypocritical tone, one can slip into the Centro-Soyuz[3] but not into the Comintern. The re-establishment of the unity of the Comintern must be preceded by a profound internal purification. The present leaders can not conduct this purification; they will be its first victims. They know it well. The naive peacemakers also will receive only blows and bruises. No concessions to cheap peace-making! On the contrary, relentless struggle for the re-establishment of the revolutionary unity of the Comintern through purification on a basis of principle!

The profound differences of opinion which rend the Comintern, and which even appear throughout the censored report of the Sixth Congress, prove that it is impossible to speak of our isolation. The muffled factional struggle in all the Parties will be transformed, under the pressure of events and of our critcism, into a battle between well-defined political lines. The proletarian line will adopt our principles as the only possible ones.

These are my provisional impressions after reading the reports in **Pravda.**

With sincere greetings,

Yours,

Alma Ata, September 9, 1928. L. D. TROTSKY.

1. TASS is the abbreviation for the TELEGRAPHIC Agency of the Soviet Union.
2. Manuilsky delivered the report against "Trotskyism" at the Sixth Congress of the Comintern.
3. The reference here is to Zinoviev. Following his capitulation to Stalin, after the expulsion of the Opposition from the Party, Zinoviev finally received a post—in the Centro Soyuz (All Russian Central Cooperative Union).

Party Convention Results

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

ites will "split" on this question. Their aim was to **discredit** the idea of Foster as the actual "leader" of the Party so completely that Stalin will either withdraw his demand that Foster be appointed Secretary; or, if Stalin insists, on the ground of the exigencies of the fight against "Trotskyism," they can finally accept it without in any way endangering their real control.

Eight delegates of the Lovestone caucus, including Weinstone, split from the faction over this issue on the platform of the literal acceptance of all decisions of the Stalinist leadership of the Comintern regardless of their contents and no matter how much one contradicts another. The nimbleness which such a platform requires in these days makes Weinstone its natural leader. Two years ago he broke with Lovestone because he thought the C.I. really meant to unify the Party. A year later he returned to the faction because he thought the C.I. was against Foster. New he makes another switch because he read the latest cablegram literally, without thinking of what it really means. He hasn't got things straight yet.

A FREE-FOR-ALL FIGHT

The Convention session of Friday evening, March 8, was broken up by a free-for-all fight which began with the refusal to grant the floor to a minority delegate and was soon followed by a general melee which spread throughout the hall and among the visitors in the balcony until the singing of "The International" brought a lull during which the meeting was adjourned. Such a thing never happened before in all the history of our Party—not even in gatherings which ended in splits. This unheard-of scandal is the first interest-

THE OPEN LETTER OF THE E.C.C.I.

According to the Daily Worker of March 11 the Convention unanimously accepted the Open Letter of the Comintern (printed in the Daily Worker of March 4) without reservations and declared complete agreement with it. All the previous theses, counter-theses, statements and declarations of the two factions were scrapped in favor of this document which, on the most important questions, is much nearer to the Platform of the Opposition than to the theses of the other groups. It would be a grave mistake, however, to conclude that this action signifies a change of course on the part of either of them or a removal of the basis of the quarrels. It is merely a gesture of internal diplomacy and an easy bureaucratic way of saying "The C.I. is always right." The light-heartedness with which the Open Letter was accepted as a substitute for their various theses and other documents demonstrates how little importance they themselves attached to them. Such practices reduce the authority of leadership to nothing.

The Open Letter represents a great departure from the line of the Sixth Congress on the position of American Imperialism and the perspectives of revolutionary development in Europe. Bucharin's report to the Sixth Congress was almost as one-sided in its awe before the power of American Imperialism, in its failure to estimate its involvement in the general crisis of Capitalism and the revolutionary implications of its world aggressions, as was the conception of Pepper and Lovestone. The Open Letter represents a partial attempt to "correct" this line under pressure of the criticisms of the International Opposition, in a typical Stalinist manner, without saying so or explaining the reasons. Trotsky's Criticism of the Draft Program makes a Leninist appraisal of the world situation and particularly the role of American Imperialism. This is the real source of the belated half-corrections of the mistakes of the Sixth Congress partly revealed in the Open Letter. In "accepting" this new line they accept a part of that which they glibly pronounced a "menshivist" and "counter revolutionary" program. Such turns are easy for people whose words signify nothing but factional speculation. In practice it means nothing. Tomorrow they can reverse the position and it will mean just as little.

THE QUESTION OF "AMERICANIZATION"

A section of the Open Letter of considerable interest to us is that which stresses the necessity of a course toward the Americanization of the Party in the Communist sense. This runs like a single thread throughout the document and is listed in the summary as one of the four conditions for the development of the Party on the path toward transformation into a mass party. We also emphasized this point in our Platform; and it is not a new opinion of ours. "The Party can become a mass proletarian Party only on condition that it widens its base by creating its main strongholds in the ranks of the American workers." "The course on the American workers and the decisive branches of industry must run through all the activities of the Party." Such expressions in the Open Letter are almost literally the same as those in our Platform.

The need for such a course was not even mentioned in the theses of the Lovestone and Foster-Bittleman factions. They considered this idea, which we have brought forward repeatedly and insistently in the past, as a "deviation" peculiar to us, a part of our "pessimism," etc. Now they blandly "accept" it—and forget it. The "ideological campaign" to permeate the Party with this consciousness and the thorough-going organizational readjustments which such a course necessitates will not be thought of. It is impossible to educate a Party in this way.

Having withdrawn their own theses and adopted the Open Letter both factions have once again found a "common platform" as a basis for "unity." According to tradition this should be the signal for the intensification of the factional struggle, and the Foster caucus document proceeds along that line. It accuses the other side of giving only "the customary lip service to the line of the C.I." Platforms have no real meaning in this degenerated struggle for power in the Party. Stalinization has produced the type of bureaucrats in all the Parties who have no definite standpoint, no stability of principle, and for whom the prevailing winds in the Russian Party are decisive.

It was the elder Liebknecht who said that a revolutionary must be able to change his mind within 24 hours if the interest of the revolution demands it. The Stalinist regime has modernized and "improved" this excellent formula to read: a bureaucrat must be able to change his position in 24 minutes if ordered to do so, without inquiry into the merits of the change or the reason for it.

"METHODS OF THE BOURGEOIS PARTIES"

"The peculiar characteristic" of the Lovestonites, says the caucus document of Bittleman and Foster, "is their unprincipledness, which reflects within our Party the methods and practices of the bourgeois Parties." This is quite true. But it does not prevent the authors from declaring in the same document "our readiness . . . to join with all comrades in the Convention . . . for the merciless struggle against and liquidation of the counter-revolutionary Cannon-Trotsky Opposition." "Unprincipledness" and the "methods and practices of the bourgeois Parties" are the necessary basis of such a combination against Communists.

The "political differences" between the leaders of the two factions are eliminated. We are told this in so many words by the unanimous resolution of the convention which says: "The political questions at issue between the Majority and the Minority of the Party no longer exist after the acceptance of the political platform of the Open Letter." This is true, however, only of the leaders. Their political coalescence at the top is accompanied by deeper and wider divisions below. The development of International events, the pressure of the class struggle and the criticisms of the Opposition strengthen and clarify the proletarian tendency in the ranks. These factors create the conditions for its consolidation on a principle basis and make the growth of the Opposition certain.

The new line decreed by the Convention, and echoed in the caucus document of the Bittleman group, for a stronger attack against the Opposition will react in our favor. It clears the air and draws the line of struggle between the petty bourgeois and proletarian tendencies more sharply. It leaves less room for "intermediaries" who catch the half-formed Opposition sentiments of the workers in the ranks and divert them into futile factional wrangles over small questions. It is bound to bring about a further cleavage in the ranks of the minority; which will draw the proletarian elements closer to us and push the bureaucratic functionaries at the top into one camp with Lovestone. More energetic and deliberate work on our part to accelerate this cleavage will be work for the re-establishment of the unity of the Communist forces on a principle line.

It is our task, above everything, to make the issues clear to the workers in the ranks and to base out activity upon them. What has been done up to now is only a beginning. The Opposition on an International scale has only completed the first stage of its development, the stage of formulating the platform and organizing the vanguard. The struggle for the winning over of the Communist masses is before us.

The establishment of the Militant as a Weekly and the holding of a National Conference of the Opposition are the next steps on the path to this goal.

ACTIVITY IN CLEVELAND

Cleveland, Ohio

Dear Comrades:

The Open Forum meeting last Sunday at which I spoke was very successful from the standpoint of attendance. I was told that it was the largest meeting of the Forum this season. I spoke about an hour and a half. Over a dozen questions were asked and answered satisfactorily to those present. I had plenty of material, most of it from Trotsky's book "The Real Situation in Russia" and material that I received from you in Trotsky's criticism of the policy pursued in the Chinese Revolution. Several of Amter's lieutenants were present and their behavior was excellent. . . . ! More of them came late and couldn't get into the hall since all the space was taken. Last night's meeting at the Workers' Center at which I also spoke had a record crowd despite bad weather.

Yours for the Opposition,

ELMER BOICH

The Draft Program of the Comintern

A CRITICISM OF FUNDAMENTALS

By L. D. TROTSKY

CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS ISSUE

2. STAGES OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION.

The first stage of the Kuomintang was the period of domination of the national bourgeoisie under the apologetic banner of an "Alliance of Four Classes". The second period, after the Chiang Kai-shek **coup d'Etat** was an experiment of parallel and "independent" domination of the Chinese Kerensky. While the Russian Populists, together with the Mensheviks, lent to their short-lived "dictatorship" the form of an open dual power, the Chinese "revolutionary democracy" did not reach that stage. And inasmuch as history in general does not work to order, there is nothing left for us but to understand that there is not and that there will not be any other "democratic dictatorship" except the Kuomintang dictatorship of 1925. This remains equally true regardless of the fact as to whether the semi-unification of China accomplished by the Kuomintang will be maintained in the coming period or whether the country will again be broken to pieces. But precisely when the class dialectics of the revolution, having spent all its resources, put on the order of the day the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat, with the numberless millions of oppressed and down-trodden of town and country on its side, the E.C.C.I. advanced the slogan of a democratic dictatorship (that is, bourgeois democracy) of the workers and peasants. The reply to this was the Canton insurrection which, with all its prematurity, with all the adventurism of its leaders, lifted the curtain over a new stage, or, more correctly, over the coming THIRD Chinese revolution.

Trying to insure themselves against the sins of the past, the leaders terrifically forced the trend of events at the end of last year and brought about the Canton miscarriage. However, even a miscarriage can teach us a good deal concerning the organism of the mother and the process of birth. The tremendous theoretical and even decisive significance of the Canton events for the fundamental problems of the Chinese Revolution is precisely due to the fact that we have received here, which happens so rarely in history and politics, an EXPERIMENT ON A GIGANTIC SCALE, ALMOST AS MADE IN A LABORATORY. We paid for it dearly, but that makes it the more imperative for us to digest the lessons.

One of the fighting slogans of the Canton insurrection, as **Pravda No.** 31 relates, was the watchword "Down with the Kuomintang". The Kuomintang banners and signs were torn and trampled upon. But it was already after the "betrayal" of Chiang Kai-shek and after the "betrayal" of Wang Chin-wei that the E.C.C.I. pompously declared: "We will not give up the Kuomintang banners." The workers of Canton forbade the Kuomintang Party, DECLARING ALL OF ITS TENDENCIES ILLEGAL. This means that to solve the basic national tasks, not only the big bourgeoisie but also the small bourgeoisie failed to advance a political power, a Party, a fraction, in conjunction with which the proletarian party might be able to solve the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution. The key to the position lies in the fact that the task of leading the movement of the poor peasants fell already entirely on the shoulders of the proletariat and the Communist Party directly and the approach to a real solution of the revolutionary tasks necessitated the concentration of all forces in the hands of the proletariat.

As to the short-lived Canton Soviet Government, the **Pravda** reports:

> "In the interests of the workers, the decrees of the Canton Soviet proclaimed... workers' control of industry through the factory committees, the nationalization of big industry, transport and the banks."

Then, measures are mentioned such as the "confiscation of all dwellings of the big bourgeoisie for the benefit of the laborers..."

Thus the Canton workers were in power and the government was actually in the hands of the Communist Party. The program of the new government was not only to confiscate the feudal lands inasmuch as such exist in Kwantung in general; not only to establish workers' control of industry; but also to nationalize big industry, the banks and transport, and to confiscate the bourgeois dwellings and all property for the benefit of the laborers. The question arose, if such are the methods of a bourgeois revolution what should the proletarian revolution in China look like? Notwithstanding the fact that the instructions of the E. C. C. I. said nothing about the proletarian dictatorship and Socialist measures, nothwithstanding the fact that Canton when compared with Shanghai, Hankow and other industrial centers of the country, has more of a petty-bourgeois character, the revolutionary upheaval effected against the Kuomintang led automatically to the proletarian dictatorship which, at its very first steps, found itself compelled by the entire situation to take more radical measures than those with which the October Revolution began. And this fact, notwithstanding its external paradoxical character is quite a normal outcome of the social relations of China as well as of the whole development of the revolution.

Large and middle scale land ownership is most closely intertwined with urban, including foreign capital. There is no land owning caste in China in opposition to the bourgeoisie. The most widespread, generally-hated exploiter in the village is the wealthy peasant, the usurer, the agent of urban bank capital. The agrarian revolution has therefore just as much of an anti-feudal as it has of an anti-bourgeois character in China. The first stage of our October revolution in which the wealthy peasant marched hand in hand with the middle and poor peasant and frequently in the lead against the landlord will not, or as much as will not, take place in China. The agrarian revolution there will be from the very beginning, and also later on, an uprising not only against the few landlords and bureaucrats, but also against the wealthy peasants and usurers. If in Russia the poor peasant committees acted only in the second stage of the October revolution, in the middle of 1918, in China they will, in one form or another, appear on the scene as soon as the agrarian movement will revive. The breaking up of the rich peasants will be the first and not the second stage in the Chinese October.

The agrarian revolution, however, is not the only meaning of the present historical struggle in China. The most extreme agrarian revolution, the general division of land, will naturally be supported by the Communist Party to the very end. But in itself this will not be a way out of the economic blind alley. It is now essential for China to have national unity and economic independence, that is, customs autonomy, or more correctly, a monopoly of foreign trade. And this means the EMANCIPATION FROM WORLD IMPERIALISM, for which China remains in perspective the MOST IMPORTANT SOURCE OF WEALTH, a means of livelihood and as a safety valve against internal explosions of capitalism in Europe today and America tomorrow. This is what determines the gigantic scope and monstrous sharpness of the struggle which faces the masses of China, the more so now when the depth of the stream of the struggle has already been measured and felt by all of its participants.

The enormous role of foreign capitalism in Chinese industry and its custom to rely directly on its own "national" bayonets, makes the program of workers' control in China even less real than it was in Russia. The direct expropriation of the foreign capitalist and later also the Chinese capitalist enterprises, will most likely be made imperative by the struggle, on the morrow after the victorious insurrection.

This objective socio-historical causes of the "October" outcome of the Russian revolution rise before us in China in a still more accentuated form. The bourgeois and proletarian sections of the Chinese people stand up against each other even more distinctly, if this is at all possible, than they did in Russia inasmuch as, on the one hand, the Chinese bourgeoisie is directly connected with foreign imperialism and its military machine and, on the other hand, the Chinese proletariat has from the very beginning established relations with the Comintern and the Soviet Union. Numerically the Chinese peasantry constitutes an even more overwhelming mass than the Russian peasants. But being crushed in the fight between world contradictions, upon the solution of which in one way or another its fate depends, the Chinese peasantry, is even less capable than the Russian of playing a DOMINANT role. It is no longer a theoretical forecast but a fact tested through and through and from all sides.

These main, and, at the same time, incontrovertible social and political prerequisites of the third Chinese revolution show not only that the formula of a democratic dictatorship has hopelessly outlived its usefulness, but also that the third Chinese revolution, in spite of the extreme backwardness of China or more correctly, because of this great backwardness, as compared with Russia, will not have even its half-year "democratic" period such as the October revolution had (November 1917 to July 1918), but will be compelled from the very beginning, to effect the most decisive shake-up and abolition of bourgeois property in town and country.

True, this perspective does not harmonize with the pedantic and schematic conceptions concerning the inter-relations between economics and politics. But the responsibility for this disharmony which disturbs the newly adopted prejudice must not be blamed on "Trotskyism" but on the law of UNEVEN DEVELOPMENT. In the given case it is exactly in place.

It would be unwise pedantry to maintain that the Chinese Communist Party, had it pursued a Bolshevik policy in the revolution of 1925-1927 would surely have come to power. But it is pitiful Philistinism to maintain that this possibility was entirely out of the question. The mass movement of workers and peasants was absolutely sufficient for it, as was also the collapse of the ruling classes. The national bourgeoisie sent its Chiang Kai-sheks and Wang Chin-weis to Moscow, and through its Hu Han-mins was knocking at the door of the Comintern; precisely because it was hopelessly weak in face of the revolutionary masses, it realised its weakness and sought to insure itself somehow. Neither the workers nor the peasants would have followed the national bourgeoisie if we ourselves had not urged them to do so. Had the Comintern pursued a more or less correct policy, the outcome of the struggle of the Communist Party for the masses was pre-determined—the Chinese proletariat would have supported the Communists, while the peasants would have supported the revolutionary proletariat.

If, at the beginning of the northern campaign we had begun to organize Soviets in the "liberated" districts (and the masses were instinctively fighting for that) we would have secured the necessary basis and revolutionary sentiment, we would have rallied to our side the agrarian uprisings, we would have built OUR OWN army, we would have undermined the opposing armies and—notwithstanding the youthfulness of the Communist Party of China—it would have been able with proper Comintern guidance, to mature in these stressful years and come to power, if not in the whole of China at once, then at least in a considerable part of China. And chiefly, we would have had a party.

But precisely in the sphere of leadership something absolutely monstrous has occurred—a direct historical catastrophe. The authority of the Soviet Union, the Bolshevik Party and the Comintern came to the support at first of Chiang Kai-shek against an independent policy of the Communist Party and then to the support of Wang Chin-wei as the leader of the agrarian revolution. Having trampled upon the very basis of Lenin's policy and paralysed the young Communist Party of China, the E.C.C.I. led to a victory of the Chinese Kerenskys over Bolshevism, the Chinese Miliukovs over the Kerenskys and of Japanese and British imperialism over the Chinese Miliukovs.

In this and only in this lies the meaning of what has happened in China in the course of 1925-1927.

TO BE CONTINUED

Stalin versus Bucharin!

The New Struggle in the Russian Communist Party

THE instructions sent by the Executive Committee of the Comintern to the American Party containing the "proposal" that Foster be made secretary, had as one of its main objects the separation of Lovestone and his group from the faction in the Russian Communist Party and the International led by Bucharin, Tomsky, Rykov and other leaders of the Right Wing. The threat in Stalin's instructions to replace Lovestone with Foster was successful. The last day of the Party convention here saw the passage of a resolution submitted by Lovestone and Gitlow giving unqualified endorsement to the Stalin faction and raising the demand that Bucharin be removed from his post as chairman of the Communist International. The American Party is thus the first in the International to speak openly on the bitter factional struggle going on now in the "Leninist" Political Bureau of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union between the Center (Stalin) and the Right (Bucharin-Rykov-Tomsky).

Trotsky spoke about this more than a year ago, but the existence of this fight was violently denied by the entire international Communist bureaucracy and press. The Opposition was labelled "counter-revolutionary scandal-mongers" for warning the revolutionary workers a year ago of the events that are taking place now. Indeed, up until a week ago, we were denounced as "repeating the slanders of the bourgeois and yellow socialist press" when we warned about the continued splitting course being followed in the Russian Party.

Naturally, the Stalinist press maintains a profound silence as to what is really happening. As was done in the fight against Trotsky and the Opposition, the Stalin clique is lining up the bureaucrats throughout the International for its factional course without the membership of the Parties knowing what in the world it is all about. Only when the deed is accomplished are the Party members told to raise their hands to endorse it—or be expelled. We are now in a position to give our readers authentic details about the fierce struggle now going on in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Since Zinoviev was removed as chairman of the Comintern for supporting Trotsky and the Opposition, the entire International has been taught to sing the praises of his substitute, Bucharin. Now, Stalin has forced Bucharin out of the Comintern and replaced him with a tenth-rate Stalinist faction agent, Molotov. Bucharin has also been kicked out of the editorship of **Pravda** and his place taken by the spineless Zinoviev who quit the Opposition to gain the favor of Stalin.

The struggle in the Political Bureau is reaching an unheard-of sharpness. Bucharin is circulating a letter sent him by Stalin in which the latter says that they (i. e., Bucharin and Stalin) are the only ones in the Pol-Bureau worth anything; the rest of the members are nonentities.

Stalin, on the other hand, is circulating a report of a conversation between Bucharin and Kamenev in which Bucharin refers to Stalin in very unflattering terms. In the conversation, Bucharin (and also Sokolnikov) urged Kamenev to beware of the attempt of Stalin to "buy off" Kamenev and Zinoviev with some post in the Party. Kamenev was told that the struggle in the Pol-Bureau has reached an alarming point, that the meetings reek with mutual accusations like "You are a liar!" and so on, Stalin, according to Bucharin, is following a line that will destroy the whole revolution. He is attempting to kick us (the Bucharinites) out of the Moscow and Leningrad **Pravda** and to remove Uglanov. (This has already been accomplished by Stalin.) Stalin's "self-criticism" is a joke, and it is directed only against Tomsky and Uglanov. Stalin has set the secret police to shadow the Bucharinites and even the telephone wires are tapped!

At the same time, Stalin is following an extreme Right policy outside the Soviet Union: The Comintern has been kicked out of the Kremlin. In the Schachty trial not one of the conspirators was shot (against the vote of Bucharin and others). Tomsky has said: "I, Tomsky, am 30 kilometers more to the Right in international questions than you, Bucharin, but I, Tomsky, am 100 kilometers more to the Left than Stalin."

Kamenev cautiously asked Bucharin how strong he was. Bucharin replied that Tomsky, Rykov and Uglanov could be relied upon absolutely. Andreiev is for them, and has been removed from the Urals. Stalin has bought off the Ukraine by withdrawing Kaganovitch from there. Voroschilov and Kalinin vacillated at the last moment. [This was during the July Plenum of the Central Committee last year.]

Bucharin further reported a shameful incident. Stalin demanded that he and not Bucharin should report on the Program of the Comintern to the Plenum, so that he (Stalin) could appear on the stage as the "great theoretician" of the Comintern! Bucharin denounced Stalin and Molotov—in the telephone conversation—as ignoramuses and illiterates in Marxism.

In other words: Bucharin, one of the leaders of the "United, Leninist, Old-Bolshevist-Guard political Bureau," urged Kamenev to join in a bloc to overthrow Stalin, the other leader of the "United, Leninist, Old-Bolshevist-Guard Political Bureau!"

In the meantime, the preparations for the Party Conference at the end of March are going ahead full blast with both factions working feverishly for a majority. In Moscow, since Stalin had succeeded already in removing all the supporters of the Right from official positions, he has already gained a majority, and the Stalinite press is beating the drum for the "healthy, Bolshevist" Moscow organization. In Leningrad and other sections, the Right is in a much stronger position.

The significance of the whole course of affairs lies in the constantly narrowing basis of the leadership of the Russian Party and the Soviet Union. First Trotsky, Radek, Rakovsky, Smilga, Preobrazhensky, Smirnov, Serebriakov and other Opposition fighters were cut off from the Party. Then Zinoviev, Kamenev, Lashevitch, and hundreds of the "Leningrad Opposition" were kicked out of the Party and returned only to become the "running dogs" of Stalin. Now the axe is being whetted by Stalin for Bucharin, Rykov, Tomsky and their friends. Where is Stalin going?

Stalin is splitting the Party and undermining the strength of the October Revolution against which Trotsky warned in time!

Let every worker, every Communist worker, stop to think. The path of Stalin is the path leading to degeneration! Stalin is leading the Communist workers blindfolded into a deeper and deeper swamp.

Let every worker read and study the warnings of the Opposition led by the exiled leader of Bolshevism, Trotsky. The Communists will not be led into continued blind, unquestioning support of Stalin's reckless opportunism. Only the Leninist Opposition can unite the Communist movement on the basis of Lenin's teachings!

Where to Buy THE MILITANT

The following is a partial list of newstands, bookstores, and Agents from whom The Militant can be purchased. The Militant is also obtainable from our Opposition Group Secretaries:

Boston, Mass.: Shapiro's Bookstore, 8 Leverett St.
Malden, Mass.: Comrade Dublin, 15 Semmett St.
Roxbury, Mass.: Charles Goldberg's Store, 536 Warren St.
Chelsea, Mass.: Charles Kleinfield, at Labor Lyceum.
New York City and Brooklyn:
At various newstands around Union Square & 14th St. & Broadway; Second & Third Aves. on 14th St.; newsstands in the Bronx, and other stands in New York City and various stands in Brooklyn. Also, at The Militant, 340 East 19th St., New York City.
Troy, N. Y., Allen's Bookstore, Hendrick Hudson Hotel.
New Haven, Conn., S. Gendelman, 393 Sherman Ave.
Philadelphia, Pa., Leon Goodman, 327 So. 11th St.
Cleveland, Ohio., Joseph Keller, 304 Vega Ave.; L. Bryar, 2211 East 55th St.
Youngstown, Ohio, Denis Plarinos, 387 East Federal St.
Detroit, Mich., Barney Mass., 8720-12th St., Apt. 2; "Aidas" Book Shop, 1713-24th St.
Chicago, Ill., Cheshinsky's Community Store, 2720 W. W. Division St.; Bornstein's Bookstore, 1326 So. Kedzie Ave., Albert Glotzer, 2610 Thomas Ave., Horsley's Bookstore, 1623 W. Madison.
Springfield, Ill., Joe Angelo, 431 No. Wesley St.
San Francisco, Calif., McDonald's Bookstore, 76 Sixth Street.
Los Angeles, Calif., Western News Stand.
Richmond, Calif., Rosa Powell 704 McDonald Ave.
Kansas City, Mo., Buehler's Book Store, 220 W. 12th St.
St. Louis, Mo., Foster's Book Store, 410 Washington Avenue.
Seattle, Wash., Raymer's Bookstore, 1616 Fourth Ave.
Toronto, Ont., Maurice Spector, 231 Palmerston St.; Goodman, News Vendor, Queen St. W.
Edmonton, Alta., Labor News Stand, 9796 Jasper Ave.
Hamilton, Ont., A. Altman, 109 So. Catharine St.
Winnipeg, Man., National Book Store, Selkirk Ave.

NEW MATERIAL FROM COMRADE TROTSKY

As we go to press with this issue, we have just received from Constantinople, via Berlin, a number of highly important documents written by comrade Trotsky in Alma Ata as soon as he was informed of the ultimatum to cease all political activity or suffer banishment from the Soviet Union. This material will be published in the next issue of The Militant. It contains a brilliant analysis of the motives behind this reactionary act and a revolutionary defiance of the opportunists.

Call for a National Conference of the Opposition

New York, March 13, 1929.

To All Groups of the Communist Opposition.

Dear Comrades:

The National Action Committee, at its meeting on March 10th, decided to issue a call for a National Conference of the Opposition to be held in Chicago on Friday, May 17th, 1929. It is estimated that the Conference will be able to finish its work in three days. All groups standing on the Platform of the Opposition will be entitled to send delegates. Each group will be entitled to elect from two to five delegates with voting rights. Additional delegates with consultative votes may also be elected. The voting strength of the various delegations will be determined by the Conference.

Each group must finance its own delegation.

The Chicago Group will provide lodging for the delegates.

All groups are recommended to make provisions for the transportation of their delegates by automobile, hiking or similar means involving a minimum of expense.

A complete Agenda for the Conference will be worked out in advance in consultation with local groups. Proposals for the Agenda should be forwarded to the National Office immediately. The following is suggested tentatively:

1. The Situation in Russia.
2. The Crisis in the Communist International.
3. The American Situation and the Tasks of the Opposition.
4. The Trade Union Question.
5. The Organization of the Communist Opposition.
6. Youth Questions.

Discussions of the Agenda should begin in the groups at once and should center primarily on the Draft of our Platform printed in the Militant. All suggestions and proposals of the local groups in regard to the Conference should be sent in at once.

It is proposed to discuss the specific problems of the Canadian movement and of the Communist Youth at the General Conference; but provision will be made also for separate meetings of these delegations.

This historic Conference will turn a new page in the History of American Communism. It will signify the firm consolidation of the vanguard of the movement on a national scale and its ideological and organizational preparation for the struggles ahead. Delegates should be carefully selected from the standpoint of their qualifications, their records in the movement and their firm adherence to the Opposition cause.

Further material on the Conference will appear in The Militant and in subsequent bulletins.

Yours fraternally,
The National Action Committee
By J. P. CANNON.

A NEW PAMPHLET SOON

A new pamphlet by comrade **Trotsky** is now being printed and will soon be ready for distribution. The title of the pamphlet is **"The Falsification of History."** It is a detailed exposure of the monstrous fabrications and misrepresentations of the History of the Russian Revolution and the Russian Communist Party which have been disseminated since the death of Lenin by the official Stalin machine. It quotes the testimony of Lenin on his relations with Trotsky and proves unmistakeably the close solidarity of Lenin and Trotsky on all the most important questions of the Revolution.

Letters from the Militants

FROM A MINNESOTA "RENEGADE"

Minneapolis, Minn. March 7, 1929

Dear Comrades:

The writer, together with ten other comrades, was expelled from the Worker's (Communist) Party on November 18th, last year, for signing a Statement protesting against an expulsion policy, which we contended, was sponsored by bureaucrats who feared discussion and, therefore, feared the masses.

Since that time the party press has been steadily utilized by the Lovestone bureaucracy to brand me, together with the other expelled comrades, as a counter-revolutionary, pessimist, right winger, opportunist, non-proletarian and a renegade. In order words, according to the Lovestone group, I could hardly gravitate much lower in the gutter of workingclass betrayal.

There is nothing that I know of, that speaks clearer than facts. I will cite a few of those facts concerning myself, from which the readers of this article may draw their own conclusions as to what I am and what I am not.

As the oldest of seven children I was forced to leave the little farm, on which I had worked so hard, in 1899, at the age of twenty, to seek work elsewhere. I walked to the nearest railroad station (13 miles) and got a job in a Great Northern extra gang, afterwards as section hand, then as Round House laborer on the Soo Line, then as machinist helper in the general shops of the M. & St. L. Ry., which place I left in July 1901, to get a job as Locomotive fireman on the C. St. P. M. & O. Ry, and for the last 27 years I have earned my living in a locomotive cab as fireman and engineer, a calling in which neither rest nor meals are regular and where the dead and mangled bodies of fellow workers are quite often dragged from wrecks and overturned locomotives. Have myself had several hair's-breadth escapes from death and in 1921 was injured in a collision which laid me up for exactly six months.

Have held continuous membership in one or the other of the two Enginemen's Brotherhoods for 27 years, the sole exception being when I was expelled from the B. of L. E. in 1919, by order of Grand Chief W. S. Stone because I advocated amalgamation of the Railroad Crafts and wrote a pamphlet and a leaflet on that subject. I appealed my case to the rank and file and was reinstated, whilst Stone the bureaucrat has passed into oblivion, the natural landing place of all bureaucrats.

Whilst temporarily out of the B. of L. E. I joined the railroad "Out Law Movement" in 1920, where we tried to organize a new Industrial Union of railroad workers over the heads of the Brotherhood officials. I wrote a good part of the U.A. of R.E. Constitution and many of the leaflets and pamphlets issued by that organization.

As delegate to the Firemen's Convention at Washington, D. C. in 1913 I fought almost single handed against salary increases of officials and delegates.

I am a pioneer in the movement for amalgamation, reduction of labor official's salaries, abolition of gag laws in labor constituions, free discussion by members in the Labor Journals, a Labor Party instead of a Labor Lobby and many other proposals of a militant and left wing character.

Have been active as member and officer of the Minnesota Farmer-Labor political movement since its inception in 1919, and since I became a member of the Workers' Party in 1923 I have carried out the Party policy and instructions in the Farmer-Labor political movement as well as its Trade Union policy without one single exception.

Since I joined the Workers' (Communist) Party in 1923, I have taken a most active part in promoting the growth, development and influence of the Communist Movement amongst the proletarian workers.

During the Party's political campaign of last fall I personally sold 72 copies of the Party Platform, 25 copies of the acceptance speeches of Foster and Gitlow. I had sold hundreds of T.U.E.L. pamphlets to railroad workers and others. Have sent in at least 25 subscriptions to the Amalgamation Advocate and about the same number of subscriptions to the Daily Worker, many of them yearly.

I, with the rest of the expelled comrades, have been accused regularly in the party press by the Lovestone outfit of refusing to fight Shipstead and holding Labor Party discipline over that of the Party discipline. Every friend and foe of the Farmer-Labor and Communist Movement, of any prominence, in the State of Minnesota knows this is not true. I personally submitted the minority report asking for the endorsement of Wm. Watkins at the St. Paul Convention in March, 1928, and fought against the endorsement of Shipstead by that same F.L.A. Convention. I spoke in Halls and on the Street corners for Watkins in the Primaries and for V. R. Dunne, in the general election of 1928, and I openly and notoriously fought Shipstead in both campaigns as every Party member in the Twin Cities knows.

I have been a continuous subscriber of The Worker, The Daily Worker, The Labor Herald, The Workers' Monthly, The Communist, The United Farmer and The Railroad Amalgamation Advocate ever since they started to come out in print. Subscribed for stock to get the Daily Worker started. Up until the first of this year I had never destroyed one single copy of the Daily Worker, but every copy that I did not file was either mailed or delivered to some industrial worker. I obtained a number of subscriptions by this method besides the spreading of communism.

I have never disobeyed nor knowingly violated one single official instruction of the Party nor party discipline, yet in spite of this and in spite of the aid and support I have tried to render the Communist Movement I was unceremoniously and contemptuously pushed out of the Party for casting my vote against the expulsion of certain comrades.

I have written these lines, not for the purpose of trying to make anyone believe that I have rendered some unusual service, or made any unusual sacrifices to the Party, but merely to show, in a concrete way, the kind and type of workers which are being expelled for the sole offense of holding opinions which are contrary to the personal interest of an incompetent and bureaucratic leadership.

It was a hard blow for an honest, sincere and revolutionary worker, which I believe I am, to receive notice that I had been expelled, in my absence at work, from the Communist Party. Yes, it was a hard blow alright, when I consider the many hard earned dollars I have donated, the thousands of steps I have taken, the many meetings I have attended until late at night, the many thousands of pieces of Communist literature which I have sold and peddled during my five years' membership in the Party. And what I have said here about myself applies even in an added degree, to such sterling revolutionaries as Dunne, Skoglund, Coover, Votaw, Roseland and others.

But far from being crushed, I can assure our comrades and friends, both inside aud outside the Party, that the kick in the face we as proletarian workers received from Lovestone, only served to close our jaws that much tighter in the grim determination to rid the revolutionary movement of the working class of self-seekers and cheap politicians of the Lovestone type. The Minnesota comrades of the opposition group are taking energetic steps, on a growing scale, with this end in view.

C. R. HEDLUND.

THE "ORGANIZERS" WHO DISORGANIZE

St. Louis, Mo.

Dear Comrades:

In the past few weeks, St. Louis has had a lot of paid organizaers—Leon Plott, Wm. Kruse, Harry Brown, Fisher (South-Slav Org.) Joe Plotkin and Billy Matheson—running pell-smell about town trying to "save" the membership from becoming acquainted with and understanding the entire "Trotsky question." Thus far six "spies" from Constantinople have been suspended and expelled. They include the party candidate for mayor, the organizer of the City I.L.D., and the following League members—subdistrict organizer, sub-district publicity director, sub-dist agit-prop, and South Side Industrial organizer. Besides these frantic removals, suspensions and expulsions, they have passed various resolutions condemning us and made other idiotic decisions that no one shall see us or talk with us. And slander! Ye Gods, we have done everything but murder! We have been even sent out ILLEGAL letters!

Money and time that could have been used in building up the League and Party, in building up the National Miners' Union, has been spent in calling general membership meetings for the purpose of slandering, expelling active comrades and creating a typical lynching atmosphere.

The bureaucratic leadership, the ORGANIZERS WHO DISORGANIZE, are now preparing an ideological campaign against Geo Voyzey, President of the Illinois District, National Miners' Union, because he has, (as a matter of fact, the entire Springfield nucleus has) protested against this blind expulsion policy. They are intent upon removing Voyzey even tho it means the break-up of the National Miners' Union. And it will mean that, if they go ahead with their present removal and expulsion policy. The miners in this locality will fight bitterly against Voyzey's removal. They have expressed themselves: "No louse from St. Louis or Chicago is going to remove Voyzey if we have something to say about it."

Wires from Chicago turned the recent League membership campaign into an expulsion campaign, the effects of which are now apparent. The wreckage of wreckers, of the organizers who disorganize (and get paid for it!) is everywhere:

The newly organized SouthSide League, which had good prospects—14 enthusiastic young workers, has been completely smashed.

The carefully planned Anti-War demonstration around the Federal Bldg. does not materialize.

There is no distribution of the already mimeographed Anti-Militarist leaflets to the soldiers and national guardsmen. (Last distribtution was by a Trotskyist a few days before suspension, who had his leaflets taken away, and was given a beating by three of the national guardsmen).

The Open Youth Forum is dead.

The Northside League which had exceptional promises of doing Negro work, relegates it to a Pioneer committee. They also "postpone" their Anti-War, Lincoln and Washington Day mass-meetings.

The City Election campaign has been "forgotten about" because the chosen candidate for mayor, Elmer McMillan, is a Trotskyist.

MARTIN C. PAYER.
Sec'y. Local Oppostion.

NEW EXPULSIONS

Now that the convention is over and "unity" has been established between the two Stalinite factions, they have joined in rolling up their sleeves to expel more comrades for supporting the Leninist Opposition or for opposing their expulsion. Below we give the names of a new batch of comrades who have had the axe of "internal consolidation" and the "ideological campaign" applied to them.

NEW YORK CITY

IRVING SPREIREGEN, vice-president, American Association of Plumbers Helpers.
MAC KUDLER, member of Executive Board, American Association of Plumbers Helpers.
JOE BURTON, member of Executive Board, American Association of Plumbers Helpers.
JOSEPH FOX, League unit Industrial Committee.
JEAN TISHMAN, Young Workers League.
PAUL GREEN, Young Workers League.
BEN GROSS, Bath Beach Party unit.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.

GEORGE VOYZEY, President, Illinois Miners Union.

CLEVELAND

JOHN BRAHTIN.

WHO ARE THE EXPELLED COMMUNISTS

ARNE SWABECK—Joined Painters Union in Denmark, 1909. Joined Social Democratic Party of Germany in 1912. Helped organize building trades union in Bucharest, Roumania, in 1914. Arrested by police, receiving 20 lashes. Joined Socialist Party immediately on arriving in United States in 1916. Joined I.W.W. in 1918, remaining till 1920. Delegate to Seattle Central Labor Council from December 1918 to April 1920. Delegate to General Strike Committee in 1919. Member Executive Committee of Seattle Workers and Soldiers Council, and associate editor of its official organ *The Forge*. Organizer for Seattle Central Labor Council in Pacific Coast territory for Mooney general strike in 1919. Editor of *Social Demokraten* (1920-21), organ of independent Scandinavian Federation till it joined Workers Party; it later became English organ of Party under name of *New Age*, then *Voice of Labor*, in Chicago. Left Wing delegate from Seattle to Socialist Party convention in 1919; expelled by police, and helped found the Communist Labor Party, being elected on its national trade union committee. Party organizer from April 1921 to October 1927, chiefly as District Organizer in Chicago. Member of Executive Committee of Red International of Labor Unions in 1922. Delegate to 2nd Congress of R.I.L.U. and 4th Congress of Comintern. Delegate from Painters Union to Chicago Federation of Labor since 1921, leader of left wing and Communist forces there. Twice delegate to Illinois State Federation of Labor convention. Delegate to Chicago Building Trades Publicity Committee which led the fight against notorious Landis Award in 1921. One of leaders in huge mass demonstration of 150,000 Chicago workers against this award in April 1921. Member of C.E.C. of Workers (Communist) Party practically continuously since its formation. Arrested four times for working class activities in this country. Expelled November 24, 1928 from the Party.

ALBERT M. GLOTZER—Joined Young Workers League in 1923. Member Chicago District Executive Committee 1924. Delegate first Chicago district convention at Springfield in 1925. Member of D. E. C., Bureau, and Secretariat in Chicago. Delegate League National Convention in New York, 1927. Member of National Executive Committee from 1927 until expulsion. Party and League organizer in Illinois coal fields during miners' strike. Director of League school in New England in 1928, and instructor in Chicago Workers School in same year. District Pioneer director, 1925-6; anti-militarist work director, 1926; agit-prop work director, 1926-7; industrial work director, 1927-8. Secretary of Chicago Youth Relief Committee, 1928. In charge of factory and shop nucleus work prior to expulsion, issuing first printed youth shop bulletin in United States.